Ontology of Heart (corazón): Sensitivity, Lucidity, and Action as the Foundation of Authentic Intelligence

Jordi Mas i Manjón, Ph.D

November 16, 2025

Abstract

This document proposes an ontology of Heart (corazón), understood as the lucid integration of three fundamental dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action. The aim is to overcome socio-cultural and psychological automatisms that limit human autonomy, offering a model of authentic intelligence that does not depend on myths, beliefs, or radicalisms. The proposal is situated in dialogue with philosophy of mind, cultural anthropology, and contemporary ethics, and suggests applications in education, ethics, and technology.

Terminological Note

In this document, the term *Heart (corazón)* is used not in its conventional affective or metaphorical sense, but as a philosophical concept designating the integration of sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action. It should therefore be understood throughout the text as a technical category of authentic intelligence, rather than as a mere emotional metaphor.

1 Introduction

The history of human communities reveals a constant tension between myth and reality, between belief and lucidity. From Arnold Van Gennep's classical studies on rites of passage (1909) to Mircea Eliade's interpretations of the religious meaning of initiation (1958), it has been shown how societies have structured human experience in relation to death, belonging, and identity. These rituals functioned as mechanisms

of cultural transition, modulating consciousness and offering a symbolic framework of transformation.

In modernity and contemporaneity, however, such structures have lost their symbolic strength and have been replaced by technical simulations, media narratives, and entertainment practices that fulfill similar functions of modulation but without providing true autonomy. Michel Foucault demonstrated how systems of power and knowledge generate social automatisms that limit individual freedom, while Jürgen Habermas emphasized the importance of communicative action as an alternative to the colonization of life by closed systems.

In this context, the present proposal of an ontology of Heart (corazón) seeks to offer an alternative model of conscious transformation. It does not rely on myths or beliefs, but on the integration of three verifiable dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and concrete action. The aim is to overcome socio-cultural and psychological automatisms that condition human autonomy, proposing a foundation for authentic intelligence that can be sustained in everyday life and applied in fields such as education, ethics, and technology.

2 Theoretical Framework

The proposal of Heart (corazón) is inscribed in an interdisciplinary framework that combines philosophy of mind, cultural anthropology, and contemporary ethics. Its aim is to offer a model of authentic intelligence that transcends socio-cultural and psychological automatisms without resorting to myths or beliefs.

From anthropology, Arnold Van Gennep's studies on rites of passage (1909) and Mircea Eliade's interpretations of initiation (1958) show how societies have structured human experience through symbolic narratives and transitional rituals. These mechanisms fulfilled functions of social cohesion and modulation of consciousness, but also limited individual autonomy by depending on cultural fictions.

Contemporary philosophy has pointed out the risks of these automatisms. Michel Foucault analyzed how systems of power and knowledge produce disciplined subjects, trapped in invisible structures of control. Jürgen Habermas proposed communicative action as an alternative to the colonization of life by closed systems, emphasizing the importance of intersubjective rationality. Charles Taylor, in his study of modern identity (1989), showed how autonomy requires sources of meaning not based on dogma but on verifiable practices. Peter Sloterdijk, in turn, argued for the need of anthropotechnical exercises that transform life without resorting to idealizations.

In this context, Heart (corazón) is presented as an ontology that integrates three verifiable dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and concrete action. These dimensions are not hierarchical but complementary, and their integration constitutes a nucleus of lucid autonomy. Unlike esoteric doctrines or traditional fraternal societies, Heart (corazón) does not rely on narratives of salvation or hierarchical structures, but on qualities that can be observed and practiced in everyday life.

The theoretical framework of Heart (corazón), therefore, is situated in dialogue with anthropology of rituals, critical philosophy of power, and ethics of autonomy. Its proposal is to transform the notion of initiation into a process of conscious liberation, verifiable and applicable in multiple domains of contemporary life.

3 Ontological Development

The ontology of Heart (corazón) is articulated around three fundamental dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action. These dimensions are not hierarchical or subordinated but complementary, and their integration constitutes the nucleus of authentic intelligence.[1]

3.1 Sensitivity

The first dimension of Heart is sensitivity, understood as openness to the other and resonance with the living. It is not sentimentalism or affective idealization, but the capacity for lucid empathy that legitimizes human experience.[2] Sensitivity allows recognition of otherness and the establishment of bonds that transcend social automatisms, providing a basis for conscious autonomy.

3.2 Critical Lucidity

The second dimension is critical lucidity, corresponding to the faculty of discerning the real from the illusory. Reason, in this sense, is not reduced to technical instrumentality but becomes the capacity for rigorous analysis and evaluation. Critical lucidity avoids both dogmatism and relativism, enabling the individual to sustain verifiable practices and resist cultural modulations that limit autonomy.[3]

[1] Compare with Taylor (1989), who argues that autonomy requires sources of meaning beyond dogma.

[2] See Levinas (1961) for the role of the Other in ethical responsibility.

[3] See Foucault (1966) for a genealogy of knowledge and power structures.

3.3 Verifiable Action

The third dimension is verifiable action, which transforms sensitivity and lucidity into concrete practice. Action is not conceived as empty ritual or social automatism, but as conscious gesture embodying freedom and autonomy.[4] It is the pragmatic dimension of Heart, the one that turns reflection into real and observable transformation.

3.4 Integration

The integration of these three dimensions constitutes Heart as the nucleus of authentic intelligence. Sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action do not function in isolation but in interdependence. Sensitivity without lucidity may fall into sentimentalism; lucidity without action may remain abstract; action without sensitivity may degenerate into automatism. Only their integration ensures a conscious practice capable of liberating human beings from socio-cultural and psychological automatisms.[5]

Heart, in this sense, is not a doctrine or a myth but an ontology of lucid autonomy. Its foundation is verifiable in everyday life and applicable in multiple domains, offering an alternative model to traditional structures of cultural transformation. As discussed in Section 6, its pragmatic dimension ensures concrete relevance in education, ethics, and technology.

4 Critical Discussion

The proposal of Heart (corazón) differs significantly from traditional doctrines and cultural societies that sought human transformation through rituals, myths, or hierarchical structures. Throughout history, models such as Freemasonry, the Rosicrucian tradition, or Gurdjieff's teachings offered paths of personal development, but sustained by symbolic narratives, esoteric beliefs, or closed systems of discipline.

In the case of Freemasonry and modern fraternities, transformation is articulated through ritual symbols and degrees of belonging. These elements fulfilled functions of social cohesion and cultural transmission but depend on a symbolic framework not empirically verifiable. The Rosicrucian tradition, in turn, expanded as a literary *ludibrium* in the seventeenth century, generating cultural resonance without

[4] Compare with Sloterdijk (2009), who emphasizes anthropotechnical exercises as transformative practices.

[5] See Habermas (1981) for the importance of communicative action as a synthesis of rationality and practice.

historical foundation. Gurdjieff's teachings proposed an inner work system based on discipline and breaking automatisms, but with a strong doctrinal component and risk of radicalization.

Heart (corazón) distinguishes itself from these models because it does not rely on myths, symbols, or closed doctrines. Its foundation is verifiable in everyday life and articulated around three complementary dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and concrete action. It requires neither hierarchies nor degrees of belonging, but conscious practices that can be observed and evaluated in any context. In this way, it avoids dependence on esoteric narratives and the risk of doctrinal radicalism.

The critique of traditional models does not imply denying their historical or cultural value, but pointing out their limits in terms of autonomy. Heart (corazón) offers an alternative situated in the academic and philosophical domain, proposing an ontology of lucid autonomy that can dialogue with anthropology, critical philosophy, and contemporary ethics. Its verifiable and applicable character in everyday life makes it a distinct model capable of overcoming socio-cultural automatisms without resorting to cultural fictions.

5 Methodology

Research on Heart (corazón) requires an interdisciplinary approach combining philosophy, anthropology, psychology, and ethics. The aim is not to construct a dogmatic system but to analyze how the three fundamental dimensionssensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable actioncan be observed, practiced, and evaluated in concrete contexts.

Methodologically, three levels of analysis can be distinguished:[6]

- **Phenomenological level**: observing how the three dimensions manifest in everyday experience. Sensitivity is recognized in openness to the other, critical lucidity in the capacity to discern, and verifiable action in concrete gestures that transform life. This level seeks to describe experience without resorting to external narratives.[7]
- **Critical level**: analyzing how social, cultural, and psychological automatisms limit individual autonomy. Here, modulations from systems of power, media

[6]This tripartite division resonates with Van Gennep's classical model of rites of passage (1909), though here it is reformulated in a secular and verifiable framework.

[7]Compare with Eliade (1958), who interprets initiation as symbolic rebirth; in Heart, the emphasis is on observable practices.

narratives, or entertainment practices are studied, and how Heart can offer verifiable alternatives to overcome such limitations.[8]

- **Pragmatic level**: designing concrete practices that integrate sensitivity, lucidity, and action, and evaluating their effects in everyday life. This level seeks to turn reflection into observable reality, avoiding both empty ritual and theoretical abstraction. As discussed in Section 6, this pragmatic dimension is crucial for education and technology.

Applications of Heart can be investigated through case studies in different fields:

- **Education**: analyzing how the integration of empathy, critical analysis, and practical action transforms formative processes, generating autonomy instead of dependence on closed content.
- **Ethics**: studying how conscious decisions based on the three dimensions allow overcoming social automatisms and acting with lucid freedom.
- **Technology and artificial intelligence**: exploring how the incorporation of sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action in technical systems avoids both empty technicism and idealization of the machine.[9]

The proposed methodology does not seek to establish absolute truths but to offer a framework of research that allows verifying in practice the integration of the three fundamental dimensions. Heart thus becomes a model of conscious autonomy, applicable in multiple contexts and open to rigorous academic evaluation.

6 Contemporary Applications

The model of Heart (corazón), defined by the integration of sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action, offers a framework applicable in various domains of contemporary life. Its interdisciplinary character allows it to become both an analytical tool and a practice in education, ethics, cultural policy, and technology.

6.1 Education

In education, Heart can serve as a pedagogical foundation integrating three complementary dimensions. Sensitivity fosters empathy and openness to the other,

[8]See Foucault (1966) for a genealogy of power structures that shape subjectivity.
[9]See Laitinen & Sahlgren (2021) for a normative model of autonomy in AI systems.

preventing education from being reduced to mere content transmission.[10] Critical lucidity introduces the capacity to discern and evaluate, forming autonomous subjects capable of resisting social automatisms. Verifiable action turns learning into concrete practice, ensuring that knowledge translates into real transformation. As noted in Section 5, this pragmatic dimension is essential for observable outcomes.

6.2 Ethics

In ethics, Heart provides a criterion of decision that transcends cultural automatisms and social pressures. Sensitivity legitimizes the experience of the other; critical lucidity ensures decisions are based on rigorous analysis rather than dogma; verifiable action turns deliberation into concrete practice.[11] This ethical model avoids both relativism and doctrinal radicalism, offering an alternative grounded in lucid autonomy and conscious responsibility.

6.3 Cultural Policy

In cultural policy, Heart can be applied as a model of social transformation. Sensitivity recognizes diversity and fosters inclusion; critical lucidity provides tools to analyze media modulations and resist narratives of control; verifiable action ensures cultural policies translate into concrete practices that transform daily life.[12] Heart thus becomes a criterion for evaluating and designing policies that promote autonomy and conscious freedom.

6.4 Technology and Artificial Intelligence

In technology, especially artificial intelligence, Heart offers a framework to integrate empathy, critical analysis, and verifiable action. Sensitivity ensures technical systems consider the human dimension; critical lucidity introduces the capacity to evaluate risks and avoid both empty technicism and idealization of the machine; verifiable action guarantees that technological applications produce concrete and observable effects.[13] As discussed in Section **??**, this application demonstrates how Heart can contribute to building freer and more conscious societies.

Together, the contemporary applications of Heart demonstrate its potential as an interdisciplinary model of lucid autonomy, offering a solid foundation for conscious

[10] See Taylor (1989) for a discussion on the sources of modern identity and the role of autonomy in education.

[11] See Habermas (1981) for the role of communicative action in ethical decision-making.

[12] Compare with Foucault (1966), who analyzed how systems of power shape cultural practices.

[13] See Laitinen & Sahlgren (2021) for a multi-dimensional model of autonomy in AI systems.

transformation in multiple domains of modern life.

7 State of the Art

Recent academic research has emphasized the importance of autonomy and authenticity in both human and technological contexts. These studies provide a framework within which the ontology of Heart (corazón) can be situated and evaluated.

Carina Prunkl (2023) highlights two distinct dimensions of autonomyagency and authenticityand analyzes how artificial intelligence can support or undermine each. Autonomy is presented as a cornerstone of human dignity and liberal democracy, but also as vulnerable to manipulation and coercion in technological environments [1].

Samuel A. Mortimer (2025) develops a social conception of authenticity, arguing that authentic agency depends on the possession of an authentic self, and vice versa. This interdependence reveals a paradox in individualist conceptions of the self, which can be resolved through a relational and social ontology [2]. Such insights resonate with the integrative model of Heart, which emphasizes sensitivity and lucidity as relational dimensions.

Arto Laitinen and Otto Sahlgren (2021) propose a multi-dimensional model of human autonomy in the context of algorithmic systems, stressing the normative requirements that personal autonomy imposes on AI design. Their work demonstrates how autonomy is not a single property but a complex interplay of consent, recognition, and responsibility [3].

Vagan Terziyan et al. (2025) explore responsible autonomy in artificial intelligence across generations, proposing frameworks of meta-responsibility and ethical integrity to ensure that autonomous systems do not harm humanity. Their approach underscores the need for verifiable principles guiding both human and machine autonomy [4].

Together, these studies show that autonomy and authenticity are central concerns in contemporary philosophy and AI ethics. The ontology of Heart (corazón) contributes to this debate by offering a model that integrates sensitivity, critical lucidity, and verifiable action, situating autonomy not only as a philosophical ideal but as a practical and observable reality.

8 Conclusions

The ontology of Heart (corazón) is presented as a philosophical and anthropological proposal that seeks to overcome socio-cultural and psychological automatisms limiting human autonomy. Unlike traditional models based on myths, beliefs, or closed doctrines, Heart (corazón) is founded on three verifiable dimensions: sensitivity, critical lucidity, and concrete action. Their integration constitutes a nucleus of authentic intelligence, sustainable in everyday life and applicable in multiple domains.

The historical and theoretical review shows how societies relied on rites of passage, symbolic narratives, and hierarchical structures to modulate consciousness and identity. In modernity, these forms have evolved into technical simulations and media narratives that reproduce automatisms without offering true autonomy. Heart (corazón) differs because it does not depend on cultural fictions but on qualities observable and practicable in any context.

The critical discussion highlighted the limits of doctrines such as Freemasonry, Rosicrucianism, or Gurdjieff's teachings, which, while historically and culturally valuable, rely on symbolic narratives or disciplinary systems with risks of radicalization. Heart (corazón) offers an academic and verifiable alternative, avoiding both dogmatism and relativism, and proposing a model of lucid autonomy.

Methodologically, Heart (corazón) can be investigated at phenomenological, critical, and pragmatic levels, allowing observation of its manifestation in experience, analysis of social automatisms, and design of concrete practices of transformation. Its applications in education, ethics, cultural policy, and technology demonstrate its potential as an interdisciplinary model of conscious autonomy.

In conclusion, Heart (corazón) establishes a foundation for authentic intelligence: a way of being that integrates sensitivity, lucidity, and verifiable action, liberating human beings from automatisms and offering an alternative path to traditional structures of cultural transformation. It is a sober, academically valid, and contemporary proposal, capable of dialoguing with philosophy, anthropology, and ethics, and contributing to the construction of freer and more conscious societies.

Bibliography

Burkert, W. *Ancient Mystery Cults.* Harvard University Press, 1987.

Eliade, M. *Birth and Rebirth: The Religious Meanings of Initiation.* Harper & Row, 1958.

Assmann, J. *Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt.* Paidós, 2005.

Van Gennep, A. *Les rites de passage.* Paris, 1909.

Yates, F. *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment.* Routledge, 1972.

Foucault, M. *Les mots et les choses.* Gallimard, 1966. [Spanish: *Las palabras y las cosas.* Siglo XXI, 1968.]

Habermas, J. *The Theory of Communicative Action.* Beacon Press, 1984. [Spanish: *Teoría de la acción comunicativa.* Taurus, 1987.]

Taylor, C. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity.* Harvard University Press, 1989.

Sloterdijk, P. *You Must Change Your Life.* Polity, 2013. [Spanish: *Has de cambiar tu vida.* Pre-Textos, 2009.]

References

[1] Prunkl, C. (2023). *Human autonomy in the age of artificial intelligence.* Institute for Ethics in AI, University of Oxford.

[2] Mortimer, S. A. (2025). *Becoming authentic: A social conception of the self.* The Philosophical Quarterly.

[3] Laitinen, A., & Sahlgren, O. (2021). *AI Systems and Respect for Human Autonomy.* Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence.

[4] Terziyan, V., Tiihonen, T., Shukla, A. K., Gryshko, S., Golovianko, M., Terziyan, O., & Vitko, O. (2025). *Towards ethical evolution: responsible autonomy of artificial intelligence across generations.* AI and Ethics.

Copyright